

To: Lester Snow, Mary Scoonover, CALFED

From: Robin Reynolds, California Department of Food and Agriculture

Subject: Follow-up to meeting of October 2, 1996

Date: October 2, 1996

Following is my input for the BDAC Assurances Working Group. These are in the form of recommended changes to specific items in the draft paper sent out under cover dated September 19, 1996, and which was the subject of the discussions at the October 2 meeting.

- Page 3 Part I- Program Components
Recommend adding an additional component:

"VII. Agriculture: preserve and protect the environmental resource of agriculture in California."

- Page 3, Part I, VI. Storage Component.
Recommend adding an additional item:

"D. In-Delta storage facility."

- Page 4, Part II - Concerns.
Recommend adding an additional general category:

"X. That the resource of agriculture be conserved and protected."

- Page 4, Part III - Needs/Objectives
recommend adding an additional need/objective:

"VIII. Agriculture.

A. That impacts on prime agricultural lands be avoided when feasible, and that unavoidable impacts be fully mitigated.

B. That water supplies to irrigated agriculture be given as high a priority as water supplies to other elements of the environment."

- Pages 6-7, Part IV - Process and Schedule for Crafting Preliminary Assurances. II.
Describe tools or methods of assurance.
Recommend splitting out the final item, I. Physical constraints.

Discussion regarding physical constraints: There is a qualitative distinction between institutional and physical assurances. The Assurances Working Group should explicitly acknowledge that the strongest assurances are those that are engineered and constructed into the physical system of the Delta. However, given the discussions at the October 2,

1996 meeting, that is all that the Working Group should do with this item. The focus of the group should then be on the institutional tools for assurance. Dealing with specific physical constraints, and thus the details of a preferred alternative, would duplicate the work of CALFED itself, and probably not be constructive, especially given the very tight schedule. Dealing with institutional assurances will be difficult enough.

To: Lester Snow, Mary Scoonover, CALFED

From: Robin Reynolds, California Department of Food and Agriculture

Subject: Follow-up to meeting of October 2, 1996

Date: October 2, 1996

Following is my input for the BDAC Assurances Working Group. These are in the form of recommended changes to specific items in the draft paper sent out under cover dated September 19, 1996, and which was the subject of the discussions at the October 2 meeting.

- Page 3 Part I- Program Components
Recommend adding an additional component:

“VII. Agriculture: preserve and protect the environmental resource of agriculture in California.”

- Page 3, Part I, VI. Storage Component.
Recommend adding an additional item:

“D. In-Delta storage facility.”

- Page 4, Part II - Concerns.
Recommend adding an additional general category:

“X. That the resource of agriculture be conserved and protected.”

- Page 4, Part III - Needs/Objectives
recommend adding an additional need/objective:

“VIII. Agriculture.

A. That impacts on prime agricultural lands be avoided when feasible, and that unavoidable impacts be fully mitigated.

B. That water supplies to irrigated agriculture be given as high a priority as water supplies to other elements of the environment.”

- Pages 6-7, Part IV - Process and Schedule for Crafting Preliminary Assurances. II.
Describe tools or methods of assurance.
Recommend splitting out the final item, I. Physical constraints.

Discussion regarding physical constraints: There is a qualitative distinction between institutional and physical assurances. The Assurances Working Group should explicitly acknowledge that the strongest assurances are those that are engineered and constructed into the physical system of the Delta. However, given the discussions at the October 2,

1996 meeting, that is all that the Working Group should do with this item. The focus of the group should then be on the institutional tools for assurance. Dealing with specific physical constraints, and thus the details of a preferred alternative, would duplicate the work of CALFED itself, and probably not be constructive, especially given the very tight schedule. Dealing with institutional assurances will be difficult enough.